arXiv:1702.06749v1 [math.PR] 22 Feb 2017

Well-posedness of nonlinear transport equation by stochastic perturbation

Jinlong Wei[a], Rongrong Tian[b] and Guangying Lv[c*]

[a] School of Statistics and Mathematics, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, Wuhan, Hubei 430073, China

[b] School of Mathematics and Statistics, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei 430074, China

[c]School of Mathematics and Statistics, Henan University Kaifeng, Henan 475001, China

Abstract

We are concerned with multidimensional nonlinear stochastic transport equation driven by Brownian motions. For irregular fluxes, by using stochastic BGK approximations and commutator estimates, we gain the existence and uniqueness of stochastic entropy solutions. Besides, for BV initial data, the BV and Hölder regularities are also derived for the unique stochastic entropy solution. Particularly, for the transport equation, we gain a regularization result, i.e. while the existence fails for the transport equation, we prove that a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type is enough to render the equation well-posed. This seems to be another explicit example (the first example is given in [22]) of a PDE of fluid dynamics that becomes well-posed under the influence of a multiplicative Brownian type noise.

MSC (2010): 60H15 (35L65 35R60)

Keywords: Transport equations; Conservation laws; Stochastic entropy solution; Regularization

*Corresponding author Email: gylvmaths@henu.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Given $T > 0$, consider the following multidimensional balance law

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + \mathrm{div}_x F(t,x,\rho) = A(t,x,\rho), \quad (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

The first complete well-posedness result for (1.1) was settled in the pioneering paper of Kružkov [30]. Under the smoothness hypothesis on F and A, Kružkov established the existence and uniqueness of generalized solutions. For a completely satisfactory well-posedness theory of conservation laws, we refer to the monograph of Dafermos [14].

An important subclass of (1.1) is that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + b(x) \cdot \nabla f(\rho) = 0, \quad (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \mathrm{div} b = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

It stems from the study on the complex fluid mixing in porous media flows, which occurs in a number of important scientific and technological contexts [10, 19, 24, 25]. A particular application of (1.2) involves two-phase fluid flow, which has been used to study the flow of water through oil in a porous medium [24, 25].

When we deal with porous media flows, spatial variations of porous formations occur at all length scales. But only the variations at the largest length scales are reliably reconstructed from data available. The heterogeneities occurring on the smaller length scales have to be incorporated stochastically, on the basis of random fields, in geostatistical models. Consequently, the flows through such formations are stochastic [26] and in the present paper, we are interested in the stochastic perturbation given by a Brownian noise.

There are many existing papers concerning (1.2) by a stochastic perturbation and most of them are concentrated on the following two cases:

- case 1: $b(x)f(\rho) = F(\rho)$ (see [3, 5, 11, 16, 21, 27, 29])

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + \mathrm{div}_x F(\rho) = A(t,x,\rho)\dot{W}(t), \ (\omega,t,x) \in \Omega \times (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where $W(t)$ is a 1-dimensional standard Brownian motion or a cylindrical Brownian motion defined on some complete probability space $(\Omega_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, P_1, (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\geqslant 0})$, the stochastic integration here is interpreted in Itô's.

- case 2: $f(\rho) = \rho$ (see [2, 20, 22, 33])

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + b(x) \cdot \nabla \rho(t,x) + \partial_{x_i} \rho(t,x) \circ \dot{B}_i(t) = 0, \ (\omega,t,x) \in \Omega \times (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where $B(t) = (B_1(t), B_2(t), \dots, B_d(t))$ is a d-dimensional standard Brownian motion defined on the classical Wiener space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0})$, i.e. Ω is the space of all continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ with uniform convergence topology, $\mathcal{F}$ is the Borel σ-field, P is the Wiener measure, $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ is the natural filtration generated by the coordinate process $W(t, \omega) = \omega(t)$. The stochastic integration with a notation $\circ$ is interpreted in Stratonovich sense.

The various well-posedness results have been established for above two cases, we sketch some recent works, which are relevant for the present paper. Firstly, we recall some existence and uniqueness results for the weak solutions in case 1. When $W(t)$ is a 1-dimensional Brownian motion and $A(t, x, \rho) = A(t, x)$, a change of variable reduces the equation into a hyperbolic conservation law with random flux, then using Kružkov's method, Kim [29] proved the existence and uniqueness of entropy solutions. For general A and space-time white noise, the uniqueness theory was first founded by Feng and Nualar in [21], but existence part was only true for $d = 1$. The first complete well-posedness result for (1.3) with cylindrical Brownian motion was obtained by Debussche and Vovelle [16] for the case of kinetic solutions. Later in [27], Hofmanová extended this result and showed that the kinetic solution was the macroscopic limit of stochastic BGK approximations. Recently, by the observations that uniform spatial BV-bound is preserved for (1.3) with noise functions $(A(t, x, \rho) = A(\rho))$ satisfying a Lipschitz condition, then in [11], Chen, Ding and Karlsen supplied an well-posedness theory of stochastic entropy solutions in L^p space. Moreover, Chen, Ding and Karlsen remarked in [11] that all the results and techniques for $A(\rho)$ can be extended easily to stochastic balance laws with additional nonhomogeneous terms, by combining with the Gröwnall inequality, such as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t, x) + \operatorname{div}_x F(x, \rho) = A(x, \rho)\dot{W}(t) + g(x, \rho), \quad (\omega, t, x) \in \Omega \times (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t, x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

for a large class of non-homogeneous terms F, g. All above mentioned works are assumed on $\mathbb{R}^d$, there are also many research works for bounded domain, such as [4, 34].

Now, let us outline latest results for case 2. For a bounded vector field b satisfying a globally Hölder continuous and an integrability condition on the divergence, in [22], Flandoli, Gubinelli and Priola obtained the existence and uniqueness of L^∞ solutions of (1.4). At the same time, in [2], by introducing a notion of renormalized solution (see [1, 19]), Attanasio and Flandoli extended the existence and uniqueness of weak bounded solution to the case of BV vector fields. A few years later, for Lebesgue vector field $b \in L^p$ $(p > d)$ and Sobolev initial data $\rho_0 \in \cap_{r\geqslant 1} W^{1,r}$, Fedrizzi and Flandoli [20] derived the existence and uniqueness of $W^{1,r}_{loc}$ solution.

Even though the works stated above are discussed the well-posedness of stochastic weak solutions, there are some differences between in case 1 and in case 2: works stated in case

1 are focused on finding the similarity between the deterministic PDE and the stochastic PDE, and works stated in case 2 are centralized on making the difference between the deterministic PDE and the stochastic PDE. Precisely speaking, in case 1, all the researchers paid their attention on how to extend the well-posedness theory of weak solutions from the deterministic PDE to the stochastic versions. But, in case 2, all the works are concerned with the regularization, i.e. how to make an ill-posed deterministic PDE become well-posed by adding a noise. And, in this article, we will care for the second issue.

Compared with works between in case 1 and in case 2, we find that the multiplicative noise given in (1.3) and (1.5) in general does not have any regularizing effect (see [11]), and the noise given in (1.4) will affect the equation (see [22]). The example given in [22] seems to be the first explicit example of a PDE of fluid dynamics that becomes well-posed under the influence of a (multiplicative) noise, i.e. while uniqueness may fail for the deterministic PDE, then a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type is enough to render the equation well-posed. For the regularization, there is another very interesting result given by [17]:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t,x,v) + v\partial_x u + [E(t,x) + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k(x) \circ \dot{B}_k]\partial_v u = 0, \ t > 0, \ x, v \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(t,x,v)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x,v), \ x, v \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(t,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(t,x,v)dv, \ E(t,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Z(x-y)\rho(t,y)dy, \end{cases}$$

where Z is a bounded function that is continuous everywhere except at $x = 0$ and has sides limits in 0^+ and 0^-. Without the noise, the equation is well-known as the Vlasov-Poisson equation, and the solution will blow up in finite time. Under the perturbation given above, Delarue, Flandoli and Vincenzi obtained the strong unique solvability of the stochastic model for any initial configuration of distinct point charges.

Sum over the regularization of a deterministic PDE by a multiplicative noise of Brownian type, we conclude that

• While uniqueness fails for a deterministic PDE, then a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type could render the equation well-posed.

• While global existence fails for a deterministic PDE, then a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type could render the solution global existence.

At the same time Flandoli and his co-authors gave some open problems. One of the open problems is how to extend the regularizing effect coming from a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type to the nonlinear conservation law (1.1) ? Currently, we concrete this open problem as the following:

• Does there exist a deterministic PDE, such that while existence fails, then a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type renders the equation well-posed ?

Inspired by the papers [11, 17, 22], in this paper we consider the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + b(x)\cdot\nabla f(\rho) + \partial_{x_i}\rho(t,x)\circ \dot{B}_i(t) = 0, \quad (\omega,t,x)\in\Omega\times(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

here the choice of Stratonovich integral in (1.6) is motivated by hyperbolicity as well. Indeed, if b and f are regular, ρ_0 smooth, Itô's formula implies that $u(t,x)=\rho(t,x+B(t))$ satisfies a nonlinear transport equation with random vector field:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t,x) + b(x+B(t))\cdot\nabla f(u) = 0, \quad (t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases}$$

Hence, if the deterministic equation is hyperbolic, so does the stochastic equation. In this sense, the Stratonovich integral keep the original structure.

Under some suitable assumptions, we will prove the existence and uniqueness of stochastic entropy solutions for the Cauchy problem (1.6). Moreover, for BV initial data, some regularity results for (1.6) are established. The well-posedness as well as the regularity of solutions for the general case ($b(x)\cdot\nabla f(\rho)$ is replaced by $b(x,\rho)\cdot\rho$ in (1.6)) will be discussed in our further paper. In particular, these results (existence, uniqueness and regularity) are applicable to the stochastic transport equation (1.4). However, for the deterministic transport equation, Crippa and De Lellis [13] had proved the non-existence for such BV-solutions. In this sense, the noise has a regularizing effect and we give a positive answer for above open problem. This seems to be an explicit example of a PDE of fluid dynamics that the existence of the weak solution fails, while a stochastic perturbation of Brownian type is enough to render the equation well-posed.

Now, we explain how we can solve the problem. In papers [17] and [22], the authors used the idea of stochastic flow coupled with a PDE. The method is available to the linear case, but not available to the nonlinear case. That is, it is hard to generalize the results to the nonlinear case by using the method of [17] and [22]. Fortunately, Lions, Perthame and Tadmor [32] introduced the kinetic formulation method and the advantage of the method is the nonlinear PDE can be changed into linear PDE. Thus we can combine the two methods together to solve the problem. Comparing (1.6) with (2.2), it is easy to find that one can change the nonlinear term $b(x)\cdot\nabla f(\rho)$ in (1.6) into linear term $f'(v)b(x)\cdot\nabla u$. In this paper, we only consider the special case (1.6) because this equation has background in physics. Meanwhile, we remark that our proofs are different from that in [17] and [22]. We also note that our results and the method used here are different from those of [23]. In [23], the author assumed that the initial data are sufficient regularity, see [23, Theorem 1.1].

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some notions for solutions to (1.6), give some preliminaries and state out the main results: Theorems 2.1

and 2.2. In Sections 3-4, the proof of Theorem 2.1 is given. Section 3 is concerned with the existence of the stochastic entropy solution and the proof of the uniqueness is given in Section 4. In last section, we prove Theorem 2.2.

We end up the section by introducing some notations.

Notations. $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ stand for the set of all smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with compact supports respectively. Correspondingly, $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ represents the non-negative elements in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ respectively. For an open subset D in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\mathcal{D}(D)$ and $\mathcal{D}_+(D)$ can be defined similarly. $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_v$ denotes the duality between $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$. $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_{t,x,v}$ is the duality between $\mathcal{D}([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and $\mathcal{D}'([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. $\mathbb{N}$ is natural numbers set. The summation convention is enforced throughout this article. $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ is always assumed. $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}=\{(x,v),x\in\mathbb{R}^d,v\in\mathbb{R}\}$, $L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}:=L^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x}):=\mathcal{C}([0,T];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^d))$, $BV_x=BV(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and other notations are similar. Here a function $\zeta\in BV_x$ means $\zeta\in L^1_{loc}$ and $D\zeta$ is a finite measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. $\mathcal{M}_b([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})$ is the space of bounded non-negative measures over $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}$, with norm given by the total variation of measures, corresponding $\mathcal{M}_b(K)$ is the space of bounded non-negative measures over $K\subset\subset\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}$. Given a measurable function ς, ς^+ is defined by $\max\{\varsigma,0\}$ and ς^- is $\max\{-\varsigma,0\}$. For $r\in\mathbb{R}$, $\mathrm{sgn}(r)=1_{(0,\infty)}(r)-1_{(-\infty,0)}(r)$. Almost surely can be abbreviated to *a.s.*.

2 Preliminaries and main results

2.1 Definitions

Definition 2.1 *Let $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P,(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geqslant0})$ be a stochastic basis, described in the introduction. Given $T>0$ and a random process (or random field) $\{\zeta_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the smallest σ-field of subsets of $[0,T]\times\Omega$, which is generated by subsets of $[0,T]\times\Omega$ of the form $(s,t]\times E_1$ with $E_1\in\mathcal{F}_s$ for $0\leqslant s<t\leqslant T$ and $\{0\}\times E_2$ with $E_2\in\mathcal{F}$. The random process (or random field) $\{\zeta_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ is said to be predictable if the function $(t,\omega)\to\zeta(t,\omega)$ is $\mathcal{P}$-measurable on $[0,T]\times\Omega$, and the random process (or random field) $\{\zeta_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$ is said to be $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}$-adapted if for any $t\in[0,T]$, the random variable (or random field) $\zeta(t)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable.*

Given $s\in[0,T]$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, consider the stochastic differential equation (SDE for short) in $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$dX(s,t)=a(X(s,t))dt+dB(t),\quad t\in[s,T],\quad X(s,t)|_{t=s}=x. \tag{2.1}$$

Definition 2.2 ([31], P114) *A stochastic homeomorphism flow on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P,(\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T})$ associated to (2.1) is a map $(s,t,x,\omega)\to X(s,t,x)(\omega)$, defined for $0\leqslant s\leqslant t\leqslant T$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $\omega\in\Omega$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that*

(i) given any $s \in [0,T]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *the process* $\{X(s,\cdot,x)\} = \{X(s,t,x),\ t \in [s,T]\}$ *is a continuous* $\{\mathcal{F}_{s,t}\}_{s\leqslant t\leqslant T}$*-adapted solution of (2.1);*

(ii) $P-a.s.$, *for all* $0 \leqslant s \leqslant t \leqslant T$, *the functions* $X(s,t,x)$, $X^{-1}(s,t,x)$ *are continuous in* (s,t,x)*;*

(iii) $P-a.s.$, $X(s,t,x) = X(r,t,X(s,r,x))$ *for all* $0 \leqslant s \leqslant r \leqslant t \leqslant T$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $X(s,s,x) = x$.

Now, we give the notion of stochastic entropy solution for (1.6).

Definition 2.3 *Let* ρ *be a predictable random field, which lies in* $L^{\infty}_{\omega,t,x} \cap \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x})$. *We call* ρ *a stochastic weak solution of (1.6) if for every* $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *and every* $t \in [0,T)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x)\rho(t,x)dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x)\rho_0(x)dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\rho)\mathrm{div}(b(x)\varphi(x))dxds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \circ dB_i(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_{x_i}\varphi(x)\rho(s,x)dx, \quad P-a.s..\end{aligned}$$

The stochastic weak solution is said to be a stochastic entropy solution, if for every $\eta \in \Xi$,

$$\partial_t \eta(\rho) + b(x)\cdot\nabla Q(\rho) + \partial_{x_i}\eta(\rho)\circ \dot{B}_i(t) \leqslant 0, \quad P-a.s.,$$

in the sense of distributions, i.e. for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_+([0,T))$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(t,x)\eta(\rho(t,x))dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(\rho)\mathrm{div}(b(x)\Psi(t,x))dxdt \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(0,x)\eta(\rho_0(x))dx + \int_0^T \circ dB_i(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_{x_i}\Psi(t,x)\eta(\rho(t,x))dx \geqslant 0,\ P-a.s.,\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi = \varphi\psi$ *and*

$$Q(\rho) = \int^{\rho} \eta'(v)f'(v)dv,\ \Xi = \{c_0\rho + \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k|\rho-\rho_k|,\ c_0,\rho_k,c_k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ are constants},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Our proof for the existence and uniqueness of stochastic entropy solutions is based upon rewriting (1.6) in its kinetic form using the classical Maxwellian

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t,x,v) + f'(v)b(x)\cdot\nabla_x u + \partial_{x_i}u\circ\dot{B}_i = \partial_v m, \quad (\omega,t,x,v) \in \Omega\times(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}, \\ u(t,x,v)|_{t=0} = \chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v),\ (x,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where $u = u(t,x,v) = \chi_{\rho(t,x)}(v) = 1_{(0,\rho(t,x))}(v) - 1_{(\rho(t,x),0)}(v)$, $0 \leqslant m$ is a bounded and predictable measure, supported in $\Omega \times (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [-N,N]$ with $N = \|\rho\|_{L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}}$. Moreover m has a continuous version. Here the boundedness is understood that $\mathbb{E}m([0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}) < \infty$, the predictability and continuity of the measure m are interpreted as follows: for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d), \psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\Big\{ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v) m(dx,dv,dr) \Big\}_{0 \leqslant t < T} \text{ is predictable} \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\lim_{s \to t} \int_0^s \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v) m(dx,dv,dr) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v) m(dx,dv,dr), \text{ for every } 0 \leqslant t < T. \tag{2.4}$$

Then, with the help of the equivalence between the stochastic entropy solution of (1.6) and the stochastic weak solution of (2.2) (see Lemma 2.1), we establish the well-posedness of (1.6). Here the notion of stochastic weak solution for (2.2) is given below:

Definition 2.4 *Assume that $0 \leqslant m(t,x,v)$ is a bounded, predictable and continuous (in time) measure, supported in v. Let u be a predictable random field, which lies in $L^\infty_{\omega,t,x} \cap \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v}) \cap L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}(L^1_v)$. We call u a stochastic weak solution of (2.2) if for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, every $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$, and every $t \in [0,T)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v) u(t,x,v) dxdv \\ =& \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v) dxdv + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} f'(v) \mathrm{div}(b(x)\varphi(x))\psi(v) u(s,x,v) dxdvds \\ &+ \int_0^t \circ dB_i(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \psi \partial_{x_i}\varphi u dxdv - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \partial_v \psi \varphi m(ds,dx,dv), \quad P-a.s.. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

2.2 Useful Lemmas

Initially, let us establish the equivalence between the stochastic entropy solution to (1.6) and the stochastic weak solution to (2.2).

Lemma 2.1 ***(Stochastic kinetic formulation)*** *Let $\rho_0 \in L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $b \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $u = \chi_\rho(v)$. $0 \leqslant m(t,x,v)$ is a bounded, predictable and continuous (in time) measure, supported in v.*

(i) If ρ is a stochastic entropy solution of (1.6), then u is a stochastic weak solution of (2.2).

(ii) Conversely, if u is a stochastic weak solution of (2.2), then ρ is a stochastic entropy solution of (1.6).

Proof. For every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\chi_{\alpha_1}(v) - \chi_{\alpha_2}(v)| dv = |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2|,$$

so $\rho \in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x} \cap \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x})$ implies $u \in \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v}) \cap L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}(L^1_v)$, and vice versa. We need to survey the rest of Lemma 2.1.

(i) Assume that ρ is a stochastic entropy solution of (1.6). Then, for every $v \in \mathbb{R}$, it renders that

$$\partial_t \eta(\rho, v) + b(x) \cdot \nabla_x Q(\rho, v) + \partial_{x_i} \eta(\rho, v) \circ \dot{B}_i(t) = -2m, \quad P - a.s., \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \eta(\rho, v) = |\rho - v| - |v|, \\ Q(\rho, v) = \mathrm{sgn}(\rho - v)[f(\rho) - f(v)] - \mathrm{sgn}(v) f(v), \\ m \text{ is a nonnegative measure on } \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

If one differentiates η, Q and m in v in distributional sense, then

$$\partial_v \eta(\rho, v) = -2u(t, x, v), \quad \partial_v Q(\rho, v) = -2f'(v)u(t, x, v), \quad P - a.s.. \tag{2.8}$$

Thus one derives the identity (2.2) in the sense of distributions for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$.

In view of that ρ is bounded, from (2.6) and (2.7), m is supported in $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [-N, N]$, with $N = \|\rho\|_{L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}}$. The predictability can be derived from the identity (2.5), accordingly, it remains to examine that m is bounded and continuous in t.

Since $m \geqslant 0$ and it is supported in a compact subset in v, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \ &\leqslant \ \langle m, \ \Psi \otimes 1 \rangle_{t,x,v} \\ &= \ -\langle \partial_t u + f'(v) b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u + \partial_{x_i} u \circ \dot{B}_i(t), \ \Psi \otimes v \rangle_{t,x,v} \\ &= \ -\langle \partial_t u + f'(v) b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u + \partial_{x_i} u \dot{B}_i(t) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x u(t, x, v), \ \Psi \otimes v \rangle_{t,x,v}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}_+([0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, and for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$.

Thanks to the fact

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g'(v)u(t,x,v)dv = g(\rho(t,x)) - g(0), \text{ for every } g \in W^{1,1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}),$$

one computes from (2.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle m,\ \Psi \otimes 1\rangle_{t,x,v} \\
=\ & \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t\Psi(t,x)\rho^2 dxdt + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Psi(0,x)\rho_0^2(x)dx \\
&+\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big[\rho(t,x)f(\rho(t,x)) - \int_0^{\rho(t,x)} f(v)dv\Big]\mathrm{div}_x(b(x)\Psi(t,x))dxdt \\
&+\frac{1}{4}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2\partial^2_{x_i,x_j}\Psi(t,x)dxdt + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2\partial_{x_i}\Psi(t,x)dxdB_i(t) \\
\leqslant\ & \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\partial_t\Psi\rho^2 dxdt + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Psi(0,x)\rho_0^2 dx + C\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho|\Big[\Psi(t,x) + |\nabla_x\Psi(t,x)|\Big]dxdt \\
&+\frac{1}{4}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2\partial^2_{x_i,x_j}\Psi(t,x)|dxdt + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2\partial_{x_i}\Psi(t,x)dxdB_i(t), \quad P-a.s.. \qquad (2.10)
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, (2.10) holds ad hoc for $\psi(t,x) = \psi(t)\theta_n(x)$, where $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_+([0,T))$, $\theta \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\theta_n(x) = \theta(\frac{x}{n}),\ \theta(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{when } |x| \leqslant 1, \\ 0, & \text{when } |x| > 2. \end{cases} \qquad (2.11)$$

For this fixed n, by an approximation demonstration, one can fetch

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \in [0, T_0 - \frac{1}{n}], \\ -n(t-T_0), & t \in (T_0 - \frac{1}{n}, T_0], \\ 0, & t \geqslant T_0, \end{cases} \qquad (2.12)$$

with every $T_0 \in [0,T)$.

Observing that the Itô isometry,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^{T_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2\partial_{x_i}(\theta_n(x))\psi(t)dxdB_i(t)\Big]^2 = \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T_0}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2|\partial_{x_i}\theta_n(x)|\psi(t)dx\Big]^2 dt, \qquad (2.13)$$

Thus we gain from (2.10)-(2.13) by letting $n \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} m(dt,dx,dv)\\
\leqslant\ & \frac{1}{2}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho_0^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho^2(T_0,x)dx\Big] + C\int_0^{T_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho(t,x)|dxdt\\
\leqslant\ & \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho_0^2 dx + C\int_0^{T}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho(t,x)|dxdt, \quad P-a.s..
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Hence m is bounded on $\Omega\times[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}$ and $m([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})\in L^1(\Omega)$.

Specially, when $T_0\to 0$, from the first inequality in (2.14) we obtain

$$\lim_{T_0\to 0}\int_0^{T_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}} m(dt,dx,dv) = 0, \quad P-a.s..$$

The arguments employed above for 0 and T_0 adapted to any $0\leqslant s,t<T$ now, yields that

$$\lim_{t\to s}\int_s^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} m(dr,dx,dv) = 0,$$

which hints m is continuous in t. Therefore u is a stochastic weak solution of (2.2).

(ii) Let us show the reverse fact. Given $\epsilon>0$ and $\bar\rho\in\mathbb{R}$, set

$$\eta_\epsilon(\cdot,\bar\rho) = (\sqrt{(\cdot-\bar\rho)^2+\epsilon^2}-\epsilon) - |\bar\rho| \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

then η_ϵ is convex, $\eta_\epsilon'(\cdot,\bar\rho)\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R})$, and

$$\eta_\epsilon(r,\bar\rho)\longrightarrow |r-\bar\rho|-|\bar\rho| \ \text{ as } \ \epsilon\longrightarrow 0.$$

In a consequence of $u(t,x,v)$ solving (2.2), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\partial_v m,\ \psi\eta_\epsilon'(v,\bar\rho)\xi_k(v)\rangle_{t,x,v}\\
=\ & \langle\partial_t u + f'(v)b(x)\cdot\nabla_x u + \partial_{x_i}u\circ\dot B_i(t),\ \psi\eta_\epsilon'(v,\bar\rho)\xi_k(v)\rangle_{t,x,v},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

for any $\Psi\in\mathcal{D}_+([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\xi\in\mathcal{D}_+(\mathbb{R})$, where

$$\xi_k(v) = \xi(\frac{v}{k}),\ 0\leqslant\xi\leqslant 1,\ \xi(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{when } |v|\leqslant 1,\\ 0, & \text{when } |v|\geqslant 2.\end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

Applying the partial integration, and noticing that m is nonnegative, one deduces

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\langle\partial_v m,\ \Psi\eta'_\epsilon(v,\bar\rho)\xi_k\rangle_{t,x,v}=-\lim_{k\to\infty}\langle m,\ \Psi[\eta''_\epsilon(v,\bar\rho)\xi_k+\eta'_\epsilon(v,\bar\rho)\xi'_k]\rangle_{t,x,v}\leqslant 0,\quad P-a.s.\tag{2.17}$$

Upon using (2.17), from (2.15), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T dt\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\partial_t\Psi(t,x)[\eta_\epsilon(\rho,\bar\rho)-\eta_\epsilon(0,\bar\rho)]dx+\int_0^T dt\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}Q_\epsilon(\rho,\bar\rho)\mathrm{div}_x(b(x)\Psi)dx\\ \geqslant\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Psi(0,x)[\eta_\epsilon(\rho_0,\bar\rho)-\eta_\epsilon(0,\bar\rho)]dx-\int_0^T\circ dB_i\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\partial_{x_i}\Psi\eta_\epsilon(\rho,\bar\rho)dx,\end{aligned}\tag{2.18}$$

by taking k to infinity, here

$$Q_\epsilon(\rho,\bar\rho)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}f'(v)\eta'_\epsilon(v,\bar\rho)u(t,x,v)dv.$$

On the other hand

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\eta'_\epsilon(v,\bar\rho)=\mathrm{sign}(v-\bar\rho)$$

and

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0}Q_\epsilon(\rho,\bar\rho)=\mathrm{sign}(\rho-\bar\rho)[f(\rho)-f(\bar\rho)]-\mathrm{sign}\bar\rho[f(\bar\rho)-f(0)],$$

for a.s. $(\omega,t,x)\in\Omega\times[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

If one lets ϵ approach to zero in (2.18), we attain the inequality in Definition 2.3, thus ρ is a stochastic entropy solution. □

Remark 2.1. Without the noise and the flux is assumed to be x-independent, the equivalence between (1.6) and (2.2) is the classical kinetic formula (see Theorem 1 in [32]), we extend the result in [32] to the the case of (1.6) and (2.2) here.

For future use, we review some other lemmas.

Lemma 2.2 ([28] P209) ***(Law of Iterated Logarithm)*** *Let $B(t)$ be the d-dimensional Brownian motion (described in introduction), then*

$$\limsup_{t\downarrow0}\frac{|B(t)|}{\sqrt{2t\log\log(1/t)}}=\sqrt{d},\quad P-a.s..\tag{2.19}$$

Lemma 2.3 ([1]) ***(i) (Commutator Estimate)*** *Assume $b\in BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathrm{div}b\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For every $w\in L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for ever smooth and even convolution kernel $\varrho_1:\mathbb{R}^d\mapsto[0,\infty)$ with $supp\varrho_1\subset B(0;1)$, define $\varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}(x)=\varepsilon_1^{-d}\varrho_1(x/\varepsilon_1)$ and*

$$r_{\varepsilon_1}:=(b\cdot\nabla w)*\varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}-b\cdot\nabla(w*\varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}).$$

Let $Q \subset O \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with Q compact and O open, and let $L := \|w\|_{L^\infty(O)}$. Then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1 \downarrow 0} \int_Q |r_{\varepsilon_1}| dx \leqslant L \int_Q \Lambda(M(x), \varrho_1(x)) d|D^s b|(x) + L(d + I(\varrho_1))|D^a b|(Q) \tag{2.20}$$

and

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1 \downarrow 0} \int_Q |r_{\varepsilon_1}| dx \leqslant L I(\varrho_1)|D^s b|(Q), \tag{2.21}$$

where $D^a b$ is the absolutely continuous part of the measure Db, and $D^s b$ is its singular part,

$$\Lambda(M, \varrho_1) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\langle Mz, \nabla \varrho_1(z)\rangle| dz, \quad I(\varrho_1) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z||\nabla \varrho_1(z)| dz,$$

and $D^s b = M|D^s b| = \varsigma \otimes \vartheta |D^s b|$ with $\varsigma \perp \vartheta$ and $\varsigma, \vartheta \in S^{d-1}$.

(ii) (Anisotropic convolution kernels) *Given $\varsigma, \vartheta \in S^{d-1}$ with $\varsigma \perp \vartheta$ and given any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ we can find a smooth, even convolution kernel ϱ_1 with compact support such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\langle z, \varsigma\rangle||\langle \nabla \varrho_1(z), \vartheta\rangle| dz < \varepsilon_1. \tag{2.22}$$

In particular $\Lambda(\varsigma \perp \vartheta, \varrho_1) < \varepsilon_1$.

2.3 Main results

It is time for us to give a position to state out main results. The first result is concentrated on the existence and uniqueness of stochastic entropy solution for (1.6).

Theorem 2.1 ***(Existence and uniqueness)*** *Let $\rho_0 \in L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$. We suppose in addition that*

$$\mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \ f' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \ \text{or} \ \mathrm{div} b = 0. \tag{2.23}$$

Then there exists a stochastic entropy solution to the Cauchy problem (1.6). Moreover, if $b \in BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, then the stochastic entropy solution is unique.

Remark 2.2. (i) When the noise vanishes, the general theory for entropy solutions was founded by Kružkov [30]. This theory is adequate for (1.2), if we assume $b \in \mathcal{C}_b^1, f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ for uniqueness, and if we assume in addition that $b \in \mathcal{C}^3$ for existence. About twenty eighteen years later, using renormalized technique, DiPerna and Lions [19] also gained the existence and uniqueness for entropy solution but only assuming $b \in W^{1,1}_{loc}, \mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty$,

$|b(x)|/(1+|x|) \in L^1 + L^\infty$ (the $W^{1,1}_{loc}$ regularity is sharp in the sense that divergence free vector-fields without integrable first derivatives exist counterexamples). Now, under the stochastic perturbation of a Brownian noise, when $\mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty$, the boundedness of b is sufficient to insure the existence of stochastic entropy solutions. Moreover, if $b \in BV_{loc}$ in addition, the uniqueness is also fulfilled. In this sense, we assert that the noise does have some regularizing effect.

(ii) In [1], Ambrosio extended DiPerna-Lions' renormalized theory to the case of $b \in BV_{loc} \cap L^\infty, \mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty$, and this method may be applied to prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the deterministic equation (1.2). Compared to the result, under the same assumption (may be weaker since the BV regularity is only essential in proving the uniqueness of solutions) of the deterministic theory, we gain the existence and uniqueness of the solution.

(iii) When f is linear, the Cauchy problem (1.6) degenerate into the Cauchy problem (1.3). For bounded vector field b satisfying a globally Hölder continuous and an integrability condition on the divergence, in [22], Flandoli, Gubinelli and Priola showed the existence and uniqueness of L^∞ solutions. As stated in [22], how to generalize the result to the nonlinear transport equation is still an open problem. The present result is an attempt to solve the problem and we extend the results given in [2, 20, 22, 33] for the linear transport equations to the transport type conservation laws.

Besides the existence and uniqueness of stochastic entropy solution, we are in a position to give a regularity result.

Theorem 2.2 ***(Regularity)*** *Let b, f, ρ_0 be described in Theorem 2.1, which insure the existence and uniqueness for stochastic entropy solutions. If $\rho_0 \in BV_x$ in addition, then the unique stochastic entropy solution ρ of (1.6) is of class $L^\infty_t(L^1_\omega(BV_x))$. Moreover, for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.*

Remark 2.3. For the deterministic equation, the existence of BV solutions for (1.2) in two space dimensions can be seen in [10] if one supposes $b \in BV \cap L^\infty, \mathrm{div} b = 0$, $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and $f' > 0$. Now, with the noise, we prove that if $\mathrm{div} b = 0$, boundedness of b and continuous differentiability of f is enough to insure the existences of the BV solution. And if one suppose $b \in BV_{loc}$ in addition, the uniqueness is conserved. Therefore, we extend the existing result but weaken the assumptions on b and f.

Our existence, uniqueness and regularity results can be extended to the case of vector field b is time dependent if one assumes the boundedness of b on time in addition. Particularly, now Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 hold ad hoc for $f(\rho) = \rho$. More precisely, we have:

Corollary 2.1 *If* $\rho_0 \in L^1_x \cap BV_x \cap L^\infty_x$, $b \in L^\infty((0,T); BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathrm{div}_x b \in L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, *then there is a unique* $\rho \in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x} \cap L^\infty_t(L^1_\omega(L^1_x \cap BV_x))$ *solving the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + b(t,x)\cdot\nabla\rho(t,x) + \partial_{x_i}\rho(t,x)\circ \dot{B}_i(t) = 0, \quad (\omega,t,x)\in\Omega\times(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

Moreover, the unique solution can be represented by $\rho(t,x) = \rho_0(X_t^{-1}(x))$. *Here* $X_t(x)$ *is the unique strong solution of*

$$dX_t(x) = b(t,X_t(x))dt + dB(t), \ t>0, \quad X_t(x)|_{t=0} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Remark 2.4. Corollary 2.1 is true if one replaces BV_x by BV_{loc} ($\zeta \in BV_{loc}$ means $\zeta \in L^1_{loc}$ and $D\zeta$ is a locally finite measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$). And now this result is analogue of Theorem 25 ([22] P40). Different from Theorem 25 in [22] (for some $\alpha>0$, $b\in L^\infty((0,T);\mathcal{C}^\alpha_b(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d))$), here the BV_{loc} regularity of b is enough o insure the existence and uniqueness of BV_{loc} solutions. This hypothesis will lead us to give a regularization (see the next Remark).

Remark 2.5. When the stochastic perturbation vanishes, (2.24) becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) + b(t,x)\cdot\nabla\rho(t,x) = 0, \quad (t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

The question posed by Crippa and De Lellis [13] (similar question can be seen in [9]) in our present background can be described as the following:

Question. Is there a complete topological vector space $S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$BV_{loc}\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^d_x) \subset S(\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^d_x) \subset L^1_{loc}\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^d_x)$$

with the following properties ?

• The topology of $S(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ is finer than the topology of $L^1_{loc}\cap L^\infty$ and coarser than the topology of $BV_{loc}\cap L^\infty$;

• Bounded subsets of $S(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ are relatively compact in $L^1_{loc}\cap L^\infty$, here $\rho_k \to \rho$ in $L^1_{loc}\cap L^\infty$ if $\|\rho_k\|_{L^\infty(K)}$ is uniformly bounded and $\|\rho_k-\rho\|_{L^1(K)}$ converges to 0 for every open set $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^d$;

• If $\rho_0 \in S(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $b\in S^d(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\mathrm{div}_x b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^d_x)$, then there exists a (possibly non unique) $\rho\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;S(\mathbb{R}^d))$ which solves (2.25) is the sense of distributions.

By using Depauw's construction (see [18]), in [13], the auhors gave a negative answer for above question to $d\geqslant 3$ (in [13], Crippa and De Lellis' construction is concentrated on divergence-free vector field b, so $b\cdot\nabla\rho = \mathrm{div}(b\rho)$). However, when dealing with the stochastic

equation and choosing $S(\mathbb{R}^d) = BV_{loc} \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we give a positive answer for above question, i.e. for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, there is a unique $\rho \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; S(\mathbb{R}^d))$ solving the Cauchy problem (2.24). This seems to be the first explicit example of a PDE of fluid dynamics that weak solutions exist under the influence of a (multiplicative) noise.

Remark 2.6. The phenomenon that a PDE of fluid dynamics that while existence fails, then a random perturbation rends the equation well-posed, occurs not only in a transport equations (regarded as a first order hyperbolic equation) but it also happens in a wave equation (regarded as a second order hyperbolic equation). Indeed, when the transport equation in (2.25) is replaced by a wave equation and $\mathbb{R}^d$ is instead of a three dimensional compact Riemann manifold M, with an additional nonhomogeneous term, it becomes

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \rho(t,x) - \Delta \rho(t,x) + \rho^3 = 0, \quad t > 0, \ x \in M, \\ \rho(t,x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x \in M. \end{cases} \tag{2.26}$$

When the initial data in $H^s(M), s < 1/2$, this problem is supercritical and can be shown to be strongly ill-posed (in the Hadamard sense). However, after a suitable randomization, Bouq and Tzvetkov [7] showed the local existence of strong solutions for (2.26) for a large set of initial data in $H^s(M), s \geqslant 1/4$. For more details in this direction, one also consults to [8].

3 Existence

In this section, we prove the first part of Theorem 2.1. That is the following

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\rho_0 \in L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$, that (2.23) holds. Then there exists a stochastic entropy solution to the Cauchy problem (1.6).*

Proof. Since the proof for $\mathrm{div} b = 0$ is similar to the case of $\mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ (in fact, it is easier), we only give the details for $\mathrm{div} b \in L^\infty$.

Inspired by Lemma 2.1, it suffices to establish the existence of stochastic weak solutions for (2.2). We found the existence of stochastic weak solutions for (2.2) by using the stochastic BGK approximation, i.e. we regard (2.2) as the $\varepsilon_1 \downarrow 0$ limit of the integro-differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v) + f'(v) b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u_{\varepsilon_1} + \partial_{x_i} u_{\varepsilon_1} \circ \dot{B}_i(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}[\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}} - u_{\varepsilon_1}], \\ u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)|_{t=0} = \chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v), \\ \rho_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon(t,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v) dv. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Here u_{ε_1} is said to be a stochastic weak solution of (3.1) if it is a predictable random field and lies in $L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}\cap\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})$. For every $\varphi\in\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, every $\psi\in\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$, every $t\in[0,T)$ and for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dxdv\\
=&\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v)dxdv+\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}f'(v)\mathrm{div}(b(x)\varphi(x))\psi(v)u_{\varepsilon_1}(s,x,v)dxdvds\\
&+\int\limits_0^t\circ dB_i(s)\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\psi\partial_{x_i}\varphi u_{\varepsilon_1}dxdv+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\psi(v)\varphi(x)[\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}}-u_{\varepsilon_1}]dxdvds.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

The proof details can be given into five steps.

Step 1. The existence and uniqueness of the strong solution for SDE.

Consider the SDE below

$$dX(s,t)=f'(v)b(X(s,t))dt+dB(t),\ t>s,\ X(t)|_{t=s}=x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\tag{3.3}$$

where $v\in\mathbb{R}$ is a parameter. Due to the hypotheses in Theorem 3.1 on f and b, with the help of classical SDE theory [35] (existence of weak solution) and [37] (uniqueness of strong solution), for every $v\in\mathbb{R}$, there is a unique strong solution $X^v(s,t,x)$ of (3.3), which is predictable (see Definition 2.1). Besides, by the Liouville theorem, we have the following Euler's identity:

$$|\nabla_x X^v(s,t,x)|=\exp(f'(v)\int_s^t\mathrm{div}b(X^v(s,r,x))dr=:J(s,t,X).$$

Observing that $\mathrm{div}b\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f'\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, for every fixed $v\in\mathbb{R}$, $X^v(s,t,x)$ forms a stochastic homemorphism flow (defined by Definition 2.2).

Now, we show that $X^v(s,t,x)$ is measurable in v. Firstly, we approximate b by Lipschitz functions b_n, such that $\sup_n|b_n|\leqslant C$. If one denotes the approximate solution by $X^v_n(s,t,x)$, then for any $v_1,v_2\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|X^{v_1}_n(s,t,x)-X^{v_2}_n(s,t,x)|\\
\leqslant\ &|f'(v_1)-f'(v_2)|\int_s^t|b_n(X^{v_1}_n(s,x))|dr+|f'(v_2)|\int_s^t|b_n(X^{v_1}_n(s,r,x))-b_n(X^{v_2}_n(s,r,x))|dr
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leqslant \quad C|f'(v_1)-f'(v_2)|(t-s)+C_n|f'(v_2)|\int_s^t |X_n^{v_1}(s,r,x)-X_n^{v_2}(s,r,x)|dr.$$

where C_n is the Lipschitz constant of b_n.

Applying Grönwall's lemma, one concludes that

$$|X_n^{v_1}(s,t,x)-X_n^{v_2}(s,t,x)| \leqslant |f'(v_1)-f'(v_2)|[C+C_n|f'(v_2)|\exp(C_n|f'(v_2)|)].$$

Thus $X_n^v(s,t,x)$ is continuous in v.

On the other hand, given $v\in\mathbb{R}$, Davie [15] proved that for almost all Brownian paths $B(t)$, there is a unique $X^v(s,t,x,\omega)$ satisfying (3.3), i.e.

$$X^v(s,t,x,\omega)=x+f'(v)\int_s^t b(X^v(s,r,x,\omega))dr+\omega(t)-\omega(s),\ t>s. \tag{3.4}$$

Correspondingly, for almost all fixed path ω, if one denotes the unique solution of the approximate equation by $X_n^v(s,t,x,\omega)$, then

$$\sup_{s\leqslant t\leqslant T}|X_n^v(s,t,x,\omega)|\leqslant |x|+C\|f'\|_{L_v^\infty}T+\sup_{s\leqslant t\leqslant T}|\omega(t)-\omega(s)|,$$

and for any $s\leqslant t_1,t_2\leqslant T$,

$$\sup_n|X_n^v(s,t_1,x,\omega)-X_n^v(s,t_2,x,\omega)|\leqslant C\|f'\|_{L_v^\infty}|t_1-t_2|.$$

Using Ascoli-Arzela's compact criterion, for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$

$$X_n^v(s,\cdot,x,\omega)\to X^v(s,\cdot,x,\omega) \text{ in } \mathcal{C}([s,T]),\ \text{as } n\to\infty.$$

Moreover, above convergence holds uniformly in v on $\mathbb{R}$ (if $f\in\mathcal{C}^1$, the convergence holds uniformly in v on $[-R,R]$ for every $R>0$). Hence $X^v(s,t,x)$ is measurable in v (see [6, P16]). Moreover, for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$, $X^\cdot(s,t,x,\omega)\in L^\infty\cap\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$.

Step 2. The existence of stochastic weak solution for (3.1).

If u_{ε_1} is a classical solution of (3.1) (i.e. continuously differentiable in t and x), along the direction (3.3), then

$$u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,X^v(0,t,x),v)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v(0,s,x))}(v)ds+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v).$$

Thus

$$u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X_{t,s}^v(x))}(v)ds+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_0(X_{t,0}^v(x))}(v), \tag{3.5}$$

where $X^v_{t,s}(x) = (X^v_{s,t}(x))^{-1} = (X^v(s,t,x))^{-1}$.

Now, we will show that if $u_{\varepsilon_1} \in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x} \cap \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})$ is a predictable random field, which satisfies (3.5), then u_{ε_1} is a stochastic weak solution of (3.1).

Let u_{ε_1} given by (3.5) and $X^v(s,t,x)$ meets (3.3), then for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for every $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v)u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dxdv \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int\limits_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{t,s})}(v)dxdvds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{t,0})}(v)dxdv \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int\limits_0^t \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} I(\varphi,J,X^v_{s,t})\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,x)}(v)dxdvds \\
&\quad + \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} I(\varphi,J,X^v_{0,t})\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v)dxdv, \quad P-a.s., \qquad (3.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where for any $0 \leqslant r \leqslant t \leqslant T$,

$$I(\varphi,J,X^v_{r,t}) = e^{\frac{r-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\varphi(X^v_{r,t}(x))J(r,t,X).$$

Using Itô's formula, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\varphi,J,X^v_{r,t}) &= \varphi(x) + \int_r^t I(\varphi,J,X^v_{r,\tau})\Big[f'(v)\mathrm{div}b(X^v_{r,\tau}(x)) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\Big]d\tau \\
&\quad + \int_r^t e^{\frac{r-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}} J(r,\tau,X)f'(v)b(X^v_{r,\tau}(x))\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(X^v_{r,\tau}(x))d\tau \\
&\quad + \int_r^t e^{\frac{r-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}} J(r,\tau,X)\partial_{x_i}\varphi(X^v_{r,\tau}(x))\circ dB_i(\tau). \qquad (3.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.6) and (3.7), one ends up with

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v)u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dxdv \\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int\limits_0^t \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(\tau,x)}(v)dxdvd\tau
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\psi(v)\Big[f'(v)\mathrm{div}(b\varphi)-\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\varphi(x)\Big]\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^\tau e^{\frac{s-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{\tau,s})}(v)ds\Big]dxdvd\tau\\
&+\int_0^t\circ dB_i(\tau)\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^\tau e^{\frac{s-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{\tau,s})}(v)ds\Big]\partial_{x_i}\varphi(x)\psi(v)dxdv\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v)dxdv\\
&+\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}e^{-\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\psi(v)\Big[f'(v)\mathrm{div}(b(x)\varphi(x))-\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\varphi(x)\Big]\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{\tau,0})}(v)dxdvd\tau\\
&+\int_0^t\circ dB_i(\tau)\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}e^{-\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\partial_{x_i}\varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{\tau,0})}(v)dxdv\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v)dxdv\\
&+\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\psi(v)f'(v)\mathrm{div}(b\varphi)\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^\tau e^{\frac{s-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{\tau,s})}(v)ds+e^{-\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{\tau,0})}(v)\Big]dxdvd\tau\\
&+\int_0^t\circ dB_i(\tau)\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^\tau e^{\frac{s-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{\tau,s})}(v)ds+e^{-\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{\tau,0})}(v)\Big]\partial_{x_i}\varphi\psi dxdv\\
&+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(\tau,x)}(v)dxdvd\tau\\
&-\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^\tau e^{\frac{s-\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{\tau,s})}(v)ds+e^{-\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{\tau,0})}(v)\Big]dxdvd\tau. \qquad (3.8)
\end{aligned}
$$

By virtue of (3.5), from (3.8), one achieves identity (3.2), so u_{ε_1} is a stochastic weak solution of (3.1). It remains to verify the existence of stochastic weak solution for (3.5).

For every $u\in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}\cap\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})$, which is predictable, defining S_{ε_1} by:

$$
(S_{\varepsilon_1}u)(t,x,v)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho^u(s,X^v_{t,s}(x))}(v)ds+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho^u_0(X^v_{t,0}(x))}(v), \qquad (3.9)
$$

with

$$
\rho^u(t,x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}u(t,x,v)dv,\quad \rho^u_0(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}u_0(x,v)dv=\rho_0(x).
$$

Then the random field $S_{\varepsilon_1}u$ is predictable. Now, we collate that (3.9) is well-defined. Indeed,

$$\|S_{\varepsilon_1}u\|_{L^\infty_{\omega,t,x,v}}\leqslant 1. \tag{3.10}$$

With the help of $\mathrm{div}b\in L^\infty$ and $f'\in L^\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|S_{\varepsilon_1}u\|_{\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})}\\
\leqslant\ & \sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^u(s,X^v_{t,s}(x))}(v)|dxdv+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^u_0(X^v_{t,0}(x))}(v)|dxdv\Big]\\
\leqslant\ & \sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^u(s,x)}(v)|\exp(f'(v)\int_s^t\mathrm{div}b(X^v_{s,r}(x))dr)dxdv\\
&+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^u_0(x)}(v)|\exp(f'(v)\int_0^t\mathrm{div}b(X^v_{0,r}(x))dr)dxdv\Big]\\
\leqslant\ & \exp(T\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x})\Big[(1-e^{-\frac{T}{\varepsilon}})\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})}+\|u_0\|_{L^1_{x,v}}\Big].
\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

By (3.10) and (3.11), thus (3.9) is well-defined. Moreover, for every $f,g\in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}\cap\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})$, and every $0<T_1\leqslant T$, we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|S_{\varepsilon_1}f-S_{\varepsilon_1}g\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T_1];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))}\\
\leqslant\ & \sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T_1}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^f(s,X^v_{t,s}(x))}(v)-\chi_{\rho^g(s,X^v_{t,s}(x))}(v)|dxdv\\
&+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^f_0(X^v_{t,0}(v))}(v)-\chi_{\rho^g_0(X^v_{t,0}(v))}(v)|dxdv\Big]\\
=\ & \sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T_1}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^f(s,x)}(v)-\chi_{\rho^g(s,x)}(v)|\exp(f'(v)\int_s^t\mathrm{div}b(X^v_{s,r})dr)dxdv\\
&+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|\chi_{\rho^f_0(x)}(v)-\chi_{\rho^g_0(x)}(v)|\exp(f'(v)\int_0^t\mathrm{div}b(X^v_{0,r}(x))dr)dxdv\Big]\\
\leqslant\ & \exp(T_1\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x})\Big[(1-e^{-\frac{T_1}{\varepsilon_1}})\|f-g\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T_1];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))}+\|f_0-g_0\|_{L^1_{x,v}}\Big].
\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

In particular, if $f_0=g_0=\chi_{\rho_0}$, from (3.12), we get

$$\|S_{\varepsilon_1}f-S_{\varepsilon_1}g\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T_1];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))}\leqslant\exp(T_1\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x})(1-e^{-\frac{T_1}{\varepsilon_1}})\|f-g\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T_1];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))}.$$

Since $0 < T_1 \leqslant T$ is arbitrary, we can select T_1 so small that $\exp(T_1\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x})(1-e^{-\frac{T_1}{\varepsilon_1}}) < 1$. We apply the Banach fixed point theorem to find a unique $u_{\varepsilon_1} \in \mathcal{C}([0,T_1];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))$ solving the Cauchy problem (3.5). By (3.10), $u_{\varepsilon_1} \in L^\infty([0,T_1];L^\infty(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))$, so $u_{\varepsilon_1}(T_1) \in L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})\cap L^\infty(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})$. We then repeat the argument above to extend our solution to the time interval $[T_1, 2T_1]$. Continuing, after finitely many steps we construct a solution existing on the interval $[0,T]$. From this, we demonstrate that there exists a unique $u_{\varepsilon_1} \in \mathcal{C}([0,T];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))\cap L^\infty([0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})$ solving the Cauchy problem (3.5).

Thanks to (3.5) and (3.11), one gains the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} &\leqslant \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}} e^{(t-s)C_0}|\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,x)}(v)|dsdxdv \\ &\quad + \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}} e^{C_0 t}|\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v)|dxdv \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}} e^{(t-s)C_0}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(s)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}ds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}e^{C_0 t}\|\rho_0\|_{L^1_x}, \quad P-a.s.,\end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$U(t) \leqslant (1-e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}})\max_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t} U(s) + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}U(0), \quad P-a.s.,$$

where $U(t) = e^{-C_0 t}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}$, $C_0 = \|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x}$. It follows that

$$\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leqslant e^{C_0 T}\|\rho_0\|_{L^1_x}, \quad P-a.s.. \tag{3.13}$$

Step 3. $u_{\varepsilon_1} \in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}(L^1_v)$ and

$$\|\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}} \leqslant \|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}(L^1_v)} \leqslant \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty_x}. \tag{3.14}$$

Obviously, the first inequality is natural. It is sufficient to show the second inequality. In fact, from (3.5), for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,v)\|_{L^\infty_x} \leqslant \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\|\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,\cdot)}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}ds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\|\chi_{\rho_0}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}. \tag{3.15}$$

If one integrates the (3.15) with respect to the variable v,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leqslant \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,\cdot)}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dvds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|\chi_{\rho_0}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv\\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\max\{\|\mathbf{1}_{(0,\rho^+_{\varepsilon_1})}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x},\|\mathbf{1}_{(-\rho^-_{\varepsilon_1},0)}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}\}dvds\\
&\quad +e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|\chi_{\rho_0}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv, \quad P-a.s., \qquad (3.16)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last line in (3.16), we have used the definition of the function $\chi_\cdot(\cdot)$ (see Section 2, after (2.2)).

Observing the fact that $\|\mathbf{1}_{(0,\rho^+_{\varepsilon_1})}(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty_x}\|\mathbf{1}_{(-\rho^-_{\varepsilon_1},0)}(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty_x}=0$, from (3.16), then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv\\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\max\{\|\rho^+_{\varepsilon_1}\|_{L^\infty_x},\|\rho^-_{\varepsilon_1}\|_{L^\infty_x}\}ds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|\chi_{\rho_0}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv\\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\Big\|\int_{\mathbb{R}}u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dv\Big\|_{L^\infty_x}ds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|\chi_{\rho_0}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv\\
&\leqslant (1-e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}})\max_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(s,\cdot,v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|\chi_{\rho_0}(v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv, \quad P-a.s., \qquad (3.17)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last inequality, we used the Minkowski inequality

$$
\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty_x(L^1_v)} \leqslant \|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{L^1_v(L^\infty_x)}.
$$

So we find that the function $J(t)$,

$$
J(t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,v)\|_{L^\infty_x}dv,
$$

satisfies

$$
J(t)\leqslant (1-e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}})\max_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t}J(s)+e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}J(0), \quad P-a.s.,
$$

which implies

$$
J(t)\leqslant J(0).
$$

With the help of the Minkowski inequality and the boundedness of ρ_0, from (3.17),

$$
\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty_{\omega,x}(L^1_v)} \leqslant \|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^\infty_\omega(L^1_v(L^\infty_x))} \leqslant \|\chi_{\rho_0}\|_{L^1_v(L^\infty_x)} \leqslant \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty_x}.
$$

Step 4. The $\varepsilon_1 \downarrow 0$ limits for approximate solutions.

In view of (3.10) and (3.14), there exist two subsequences (denoted them by themselves for simplicity) $\{u_{\varepsilon_1}\}$ and $\{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}\}$, such that

$$u_{\varepsilon_1} \xrightarrow{w*} u \ \text{ in } \ L^\infty_{\omega,t,x,v}, \quad \rho_{\varepsilon_1} \xrightarrow{w*} \rho \ \text{ in } \ L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}, \ \text{ as } \ \varepsilon_1 \to 0. \tag{3.18}$$

Since the space of predictable process is weakly-closed, u and ρ are predictable. On the other hand, by (3.13) and the weak lower semi-continuity, $u \in L^\infty_{\omega,t,x}(L^1_v)$. Since $\rho_{\varepsilon_1} \in \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x})$, let us check that: $\rho \in \mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x})$. To show this result, one first supposes that $\rho_0 \in BV_x$, then $u_0 = \chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v) \in BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})$ and

$$|D_x u_0|(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}) = |D_x \rho_0|(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{3.19}$$

where the total variation $|\cdot|$ of a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued measure $|D_x\rho_0|$ (or $|D_x u_0|$) is denoted by

$$|D_x\rho_0|(\mathbb{R}^d) := \sup\Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |D_x\rho_0(E_i)| : E_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ \text{ pairwise disjoint} \Big\}.$$

To prove this, for every compact set E in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then

$$\limsup_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int\limits_{E\times\mathbb{R}} |u_0(x, v+h) - u_0(x,v)| dxdv = 2\mathcal{L}^d(E),$$

where $\mathcal{L}^d$ is the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

On the other hand, if one lets $\{e_j, j = 1, 2, ., d\}$ denote the standard orthogonal basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$, then for any $1 \leqslant j \leqslant d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} |u_0(x + he_j, v) - u_0(x,v)| dxdv \\ = \ & \limsup_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\rho_0(x + he_j) - \rho_0(x)| dx \\ = \ & |D_{x_j}\rho_0|(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{aligned}$$

With the help of Theorem 1.7.2 (see [14, P17]), then $u_0 = \chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v) \in BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})$.

Let u_{ε_1} be the unique solution of (3.1), with initial value χ_{ρ_0} and let $u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v) = u_{\varepsilon_1}(t, x + he_j, v)$, with the aid of the calculations in Step 2, then

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v) + f'(v) b_1(x) \cdot \nabla_x u_{\varepsilon_1} + \partial_{x_i} u^1_{\varepsilon_1} \circ \dot{B}_i(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\Big[\chi_{\rho^1_{\varepsilon_1}} - u^1_{\varepsilon_1}\Big], \\ u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)|_{t=0} = \chi_{\rho_0(x+he_j)}(v), \\ \rho^1_\varepsilon = \rho^1_\varepsilon(t,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v) dv, \end{cases} \tag{3.20}$$

where $b_1(x) = b(x + he_j)$. Moreover, the unique solution has following equivalent representation:

$$u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho^1_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^{1,v}_{t,s}(x))}(v)ds + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}\chi_{\rho_0(X^{1,v}_{t,0}(x)+he_j)}(v), \tag{3.21}$$

where $X^{1,v}_{t,s}(x) = (X^{1,v}_{s,t}(x))^{-1} = (X^{1,v}(s,t,x))^{-1}$ and $X^{1,v}(s,t,x)$ satisfies

$$dX^{1,v}(s,t,x) = f'(v)b_1(X^{1,v}(s,t,x))dt + dB(t),\ t > s, \quad X^{1,v}(s,t,x)|_{t=s} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.22}$$

Therefore, for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\varepsilon_1} - u^1_{\varepsilon_1}\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leqslant & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}|\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^v_{t,s}(x))}(v) - \chi_{\rho^1_{\varepsilon_1}(s,X^{1,v}_{t,s}(x))}(v)|dsdxdv \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}|\chi_{\rho_0(X^v_{t,0}(x))}(v) - \chi_{\rho_0(X^{1,v}_{t,0}(x)+he_j)}(v)|dxdv.\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Due to the uniqueness of strong solution for SDE (3.3),

$$X^{1,v}(s,t,x) = X(s,t,x+he_j,v) - he_j. \tag{3.24}$$

Let C_0 be given in (3.13). From (3.23) and (3.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t) - u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leqslant & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}e^{(t-s)C_0}|\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(s,x)}(v) - \chi_{\rho^1_{\varepsilon_1}(s,x)}(v)|dsdxdv \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}e^{C_0t}|\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v) - \chi_{\rho_0(x+he_j)}(v)|dxdv \\ \leqslant & \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{\varepsilon_1}}e^{(t-s)C_0}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(s) - u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(s)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}ds \\ & + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}e^{C_0t}\|\rho_0(x) - \rho_0(x+he_j)\|_{L^1_x}, \quad P-a.s.,\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Set $H(t) = e^{-C_0t}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t) - u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}$, then from (3.25), one derives

$$H(t) \leqslant (1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}})\max_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t} H(s) + e^{-\frac{t}{\varepsilon_1}}H(0), \quad P-a.s., \tag{3.26}$$

which implies

$$e^{-C_0t}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t) - u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leqslant \|\rho_0(x) - \rho_0(x+he_j)\|_{L^1_x}, \quad P-a.s..$$

Therefore, we achieve

$$\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)-u^1_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}\leqslant e^{C_0T}\|\rho_0(x)-\rho_0(x+he_j)\|_{L^1_x},\quad P-a.s.. \tag{3.27}$$

From (3.27) and (3.13), we conclude that: for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$, $u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\in BV_x(L^1_v)$, and

$$\|\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{BV_x}\leqslant e^{C_0T}\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x}. \tag{3.28}$$

On the other hand, if we define $u^2_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)=u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x+B(t),v)$, then (3.1) has an equivalent representation below (the proof is similar to (3.5)-(3.12)):

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u^2_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)+f'(v)b_2(x)\cdot\nabla_x u^2_{\varepsilon_1}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}[\chi_{\rho^2_{\varepsilon_1}}-u^2_{\varepsilon_1}],\\ u^2_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)|_{t=0}=\chi_{\rho_0(x)}(v),\\ \rho^2_{\varepsilon}(t,x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}u^2_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dv,\\ b_2(x)=b(x+B(t)).\end{cases} \tag{3.29}$$

From (3.29), with the aid of hypothesis (2.23) and inequality (3.27), for any $0\leqslant t_1\leqslant t_2\leqslant T$, we fulfill

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_1,\cdot+B(t_1))-\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_2,\cdot+B(t_2))\|_{L^1_x}\\ =&\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^d b_2(\cdot)\cdot\nabla_x\int_{\mathbb{R}}f'(v)u^2_{\varepsilon_1}(t,\cdot,v)dv\Big\|_{L^1_x}dt\\ \leqslant&\ e^{C_0T}\|b\|_{L^\infty_x}\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}|t_1-t_2|\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x},\quad P-a.s..\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

By (3.28) and (3.30), so

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_1)-\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_2)\|_{L^1_x}\\ \leqslant&\ \|\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_2,\cdot)-\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_2,\cdot+B(t_2)-B(t_1))\|_{L^1_x}+C|t_1-t_2|\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x}\\ \leqslant&\ C(|B(t_2)-B(t_1)|+|t_1-t_2|)\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x},\quad P-a.s..\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

By virtue of (2.19) in Lemma 2.2, and notice that $B(t_2)-B(t_1)\overset{d}{=}B(t_2-t_1)$, from (3.31), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_1,\cdot)-\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t_2,\cdot)\|_{L^1_x}\\ \leqslant&\ C(\sqrt{|t_1-t_2|\log\log(1/|t_1-t_2|)}+|t_1-t_2|)\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x}\end{aligned}$$

$$\leqslant \quad C(|t_1-t_2|^{1/3}+|t_1-t_2|)\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x}, \quad P-a.s., \tag{3.32}$$

if t_1-t_2 is sufficiently small.

Combining (3.28) and (3.32), with the aid of Helly's theorem (see [14, P17]) and Ascoli-Arzela's compact criterion, given $T^0<T$ (sufficiently small), then for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(\cdot,\cdot,\omega)\longrightarrow \rho^\omega\in\mathcal{C}([0,T^0];L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)),\ \text{as } \varepsilon_1\to 0.$$

After repeating above calculations finitely many times, one derives that for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$

$$\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(\cdot,\cdot,\omega)\longrightarrow \rho^\omega\in\mathcal{C}([0,T];L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)),\ \text{as } \varepsilon_1\to 0. \tag{3.33}$$

Then Fatou's lemma and inequality (3.13) use,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho^\omega(t,x)|dx &\leqslant \liminf_{\varepsilon_1\to 0}\sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho^\omega_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x)|dx\\ &\leqslant \liminf_{\varepsilon_1\to 0}\sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v,\omega)|dxdv\\ &\leqslant e^{C_0T}\|\rho_0\|_{L^1_x}, \quad P-a.s..\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

In view of (3.33) and (3.34), by applying dominated convergence, one concludes

$$\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)\longrightarrow \rho(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)\in\mathcal{C}([0,T];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^d)),\ \text{as } \varepsilon_1\to 0. \tag{3.35}$$

and this completes the proof for BV initial data. For general initial value $\rho_0\in L^\infty\cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we can justify it by standard cutoff and BV-regularization of initial data (consult [12]), we omit the details here.

Step 5. $\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}[\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}}-u_{\varepsilon_1}]=\partial_v m_{\varepsilon_1}$, $u(t,x,v)=\chi_{\rho(t,x)}(v)$ and ρ solves (1.6).

Let $(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ be fixed, assuming without loss of generality that $\rho_{\varepsilon_1}\geqslant 0$, define

$$m_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}\int_{-\infty}^{v}[\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x)}(r)-u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,r)]dr.$$

In view of (3.5),

$$u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,r)\in\begin{cases}[0,1], & \text{when } r>0,\\ [-1,0], & \text{when } r<0.\end{cases}$$

Hence $m_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)$ is nondecreasing on $(-\infty,\rho_{\varepsilon_1})$ and nonincreasing on $[\rho_{\varepsilon_1},\infty)$. On the other side, $m_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,-\infty)=m_\varepsilon(t,x,\infty)=0$, we conclude $m_{\varepsilon_1}\geqslant 0$.

Since $\rho_0\in L^\infty\cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, owing to (3.5) and (3.14), we get

$$\text{supp}m_{\varepsilon_1}\subset[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times[-N,N],$$

where $N = \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$.

Repeating the calculations from (2.9) to (2.14), it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^T dt\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx\int_{\mathbb{R}} m_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dv\Big|^2\\
=\ &\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^T dt\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx\int_{-N}^{N} dv\int_{-N}^{v}[-\partial_t u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,r)+\mathrm{div}b(x)f'(r)u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,r)]dr\Big|^2\\
\leqslant\ &12N^2\Big[\mathbb{E}\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(T)\|^2_{L^1_{x,v}}+\|\rho_0\|^2_{L^1_x}+\|\mathrm{div}b\|^2_{L^\infty_x}\|f'\|^2_{L^\infty_v}\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^T\|u_{\varepsilon_1}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}dt\Big|^2\Big]. \quad (3.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (3.13), it follows from (3.36) that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^T dt\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx\int_{\mathbb{R}} m_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)dv\Big|^2\leqslant 12N^2\Big[e^{2C_0T}+1+C_0^2T^2e^{2C_0T}\Big]\|\rho_0\|^2_{L^1_x}.$$

Whence m_{ε_1} is bounded uniformly in ε_1.

By extracting a unlabeled subsequence, one achieves

$$m_{\varepsilon_1}\overset{w*}{\longrightarrow} m\geqslant 0 \text{ in } \ L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{M}_b([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v})),\ \text{as } \varepsilon_1\to 0.$$

In particular, for every $\varphi\in\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, every $\psi\in\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$, every $h\in L^2(\Omega)$ and every $l\in L^2(0,T)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon_1\to 0}\mathbb{E}\Big[h\int_0^T l(t)m_{\varepsilon_1}(\varphi\psi)(t)dt\Big]=\mathbb{E}\Big[h\int_0^T l(t)m(\varphi\psi)(t)dt\Big]$$

where

$$m_{\varepsilon_1}(\varphi\psi)(t)=\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}\varphi(x)\psi(v)m_{\varepsilon_1}(ds,dx,dv),$$

hence (2.3) holds.

Observing that $u_{\varepsilon_1}\overset{w*}{\longrightarrow} u$ in $L^\infty_{\omega,t,x,v}$, $\rho_{\varepsilon_1}\longrightarrow\rho$ in $\mathcal{C}([0,T];L^1(\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $m_{\varepsilon_1}\overset{w*}{\longrightarrow} m$ in $L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{M}_b([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}))$, so $u_{\varepsilon_1}(t,x,v)-\chi_{\rho_{\varepsilon_1}}(v)\to 0$ in the distributional sense. Then $u=\chi_{\rho(t,x)}(v)\in\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})$ meets (2.3) in the distributional sense, for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$. On the other hand, $u\in\mathcal{C}_t(L^1_{\omega,x,v})$, which implies (2.5) holds, and by Lemma 2.1, (2.4) is true, thus ρ is a stochastic entropy solution to (1.6). □

Remark 3.1. (i) Consider the multi-dimensional scalar conservation laws driven by a multiplicative cylindrical Brownian motion $W(t)$ on a d-dimensional torus

$$d\rho(t,x)+\mathrm{div}_x F(\rho)dt=A(\rho)dW(t),\quad t\in(0,T),\quad x\in\mathbb{T}^d. \quad (3.37)$$

Under the assumption that: $F \in \mathcal{C}^{4,\eta}$ for some $\eta > 0$, with a polynomial growth of its first derivative, $\rho_0 \in L^p(\Omega \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$, in [27], using stochastic BGK approximation, Hofmanová obtained the existence of the stochastic kinetic solution, which lied in $L^p(\Omega; L^\infty([0,T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)))$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$ (for more details about (3.37), one also consults to [16, 36]). Different from [27], under the assumption that $\rho_0 \in L^\infty \cap L^1$, we prove that (1.6) exists a stochastic entropy solution (it is also a stochastic kinetic solution). Besides the stochastic entropy solution is a continuous semi-martingale.

(ii) For simplicity, here we only discuss the noise given by $\partial_{x_i}\rho \circ \dot{B}_i(t)$, however, the method is appropriate for the stochastic balance law below

$$\partial_t \rho(t,x) + b(x) \cdot \nabla_x f(\rho) + \partial_{x_i} G_{i,j}(t,\rho) \circ \dot{B}_j(t) = A(t,\rho), \ (\omega, t, x) \in \Omega \times (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

here $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d, \ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant n, \ d, n \in \mathbb{N}$. But now one should replace the SDE (3.3) by

$$\begin{pmatrix} dX(t) \\ dV(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f'(v)b(X(t))dt + \partial_v G(t,V) dB^\top(t) \\ A(t,V)dt \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} X(0) \\ V(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ v \end{pmatrix},$$

where $G(t,v) = (G_{i,j}(t,v)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, $B = (B_1, B_2, \cdots, B_n)$ is a standard n-dimensional Brownian motion.

4 Uniqueness

This section is devoted to prove the second part of Theorem 2.1. That is stated as below

Theorem 4.1 *Let $\rho_0 \in L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \cap BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$. We suppose in addition that $\mathrm{div}_x b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the stochastic entropy solution to the Cauchy problem (1.6) is unique.*

Proof. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be two stochastic entropy solutions of (1.6), with initial values $\rho_{0,1}$ and $\rho_{0,2}$, respectively. Then $u_1 = \chi_{\rho_1}$ and $u_2 = \chi_{\rho_2}$ are stochastic weak solutions of (2.3) with nonhomogeneous terms $\partial_v m_1$ and $\partial_v m_2$, initial data $u_{0,1} = \chi_{\rho_{0,1}}$ and $u_{0,2} = \chi_{\rho_{0,2}}$, respectively.

Suppose that ϱ_1 is a regularization kernel stated in Lemma 2.3. Let ϱ be another regularization kernel, i.e. $\varrho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathbb{R})$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varrho(r)dr = 1$. For $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, set $\varrho_{\varepsilon_2}(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2}\varrho(\frac{t}{\varepsilon_2})$, then $u_\iota^\varepsilon := u_\iota * \varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1} * \varrho_{\varepsilon_2}$ $(\iota = 1, 2)$ meet

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_\iota^\varepsilon + f'(v)b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u_\iota^\varepsilon + \partial_{x_i} u_\iota^\varepsilon \circ \dot{B}_i(t) = \partial_v m_\iota^\varepsilon + R_\iota^\varepsilon, \\ u_\iota^\varepsilon(t,x,v)|_{t=0} = \chi_{\rho_0^\iota} * \varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}(x,v), \end{cases}$$

where

$$u_\iota(t,x,v) := 0, \ \text{when } t \bar{\in} [0,T], \ R_\iota^\varepsilon = f'(v)b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u_\iota^\varepsilon - f'(v)[b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u_\iota]^\varepsilon.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_\varepsilon : \quad = \quad & \partial_t[|u_1^\varepsilon| + |u_2^\varepsilon| - 2u_1^\varepsilon u_2^\varepsilon] + f'(v)b(x)\cdot\nabla_x[|u_1^\varepsilon| + |u_2^\varepsilon| - 2u_1^\varepsilon u_2^\varepsilon] \\ & +\partial_{x_i}[|u_1^\varepsilon| + |u_2^\varepsilon| - 2u_1^\varepsilon u_2^\varepsilon]\circ \dot{B}_i - \mathrm{sgn}(v)\partial_v(m_1^\varepsilon + m_2^\varepsilon) \\ & +2(u_1^\varepsilon \partial_v m_2^\varepsilon + u_2^\varepsilon \partial_v m_1^\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

then

$$\sigma_\varepsilon = \mathrm{sgn}(v)(R_1^\varepsilon + R_2^\varepsilon) - 2(u_1^\varepsilon R_2^\varepsilon + u_2^\varepsilon R_1^\varepsilon), \tag{4.2}$$

for $|u_\iota^\varepsilon| = \mathrm{sgn}(v)u_\iota^\varepsilon$.

Since u_1^ε and u_2^ε are bounded in x, v, using the estimates (2.20), (2.21) in Lemma 2.3, then for any $K = K_1 \times K_2$ with $K_1 \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^d, K_2 \subset\subset \mathbb{R}$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon_1\downarrow 0}\limsup_{\varepsilon_2\downarrow 0}\int_K |R_\iota^\varepsilon| dxdv \\ \leqslant \quad & \mathcal{L}(K_2)\int_{K_1}\Lambda(M(x),\varrho_1(x))d|D^s b|(x) + C\mathcal{L}(K_2)(d + I(\varrho_1))|D^a b|(K_1), \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1\downarrow 0}\limsup_{\varepsilon_2\downarrow 0}\int_K |R_\iota^\varepsilon| dxdv \leqslant \mathcal{L}(K_2)I(\varrho_1)|D^s b|(K_1), \tag{4.4}$$

for almost all $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$, with $\iota = 1, 2$.

Thanks to (4.2)-(4.4), for ε_1 sufficiently small, let K be given above, then $\sigma_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T]; \mathcal{M}_b(K))$, and there is a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon_1\downarrow 0}\limsup_{\varepsilon_2\downarrow 0}\int_K |\sigma_\varepsilon| dxdv \\ \leqslant \quad & C\mathcal{L}(K_2)\int_{K_1}\Lambda(M(x),\varrho_1(x))d|D^s b|(x) + C\mathcal{L}(K_2)(d + I(\varrho_1))|D^a b|(K_1), \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon_1\downarrow 0}\limsup_{\varepsilon_2\downarrow 0}\int_K |\sigma_\varepsilon| dxdv \leqslant C\mathcal{L}(K_2)I(\varrho_1)|D^s b|(K_1), \tag{4.6}$$

for almost all $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$, which hint that

$$\sigma_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{w*} \sigma \text{ in } \ L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T]; \mathcal{M}_b(K)), \text{ as } \varepsilon_2 \to 0 \text{ first, } \varepsilon_1 \to 0 \text{ next.}$$

Now we show $\sigma = 0$. Indeed, with the aid of (4.6), one concludes σ is singular with Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{L}^{d+1}$, then (4.5) uses, we derive for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d), \psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$|\langle \sigma, \varphi\psi \rangle| \leqslant C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(M(x), \varrho_1(x)) d|D^s b|(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(v)| dv, \ a.s.\ (\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]. \tag{4.7}$$

From (4.7) and Lemma 2.3 (ii), by minimizing the even kernel, we claim that $\sigma = 0$.

Let θ and θ_n be given in (2.11), ξ and ξ_k be given in (2.16). From (4.2), for almost all $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \sigma_\varepsilon \xi_k(v)\theta_n(x) dxdv \\
=\ & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1^\varepsilon| + |u_2^\varepsilon| - 2u_1^\varepsilon u_2^\varepsilon] \xi_k(v)\theta_n(x) dxdv \\
& - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1^\varepsilon| + |u_2^\varepsilon| - 2u_1^\varepsilon u_2^\varepsilon] \xi_k(v) f'(v) b(x) \cdot \nabla_x \theta_n(x) dxdv \\
& - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1^\varepsilon| + |u_2^\varepsilon| - 2u_1^\varepsilon u_2^\varepsilon] \partial_{x_i} \theta_n(x) \xi_k(v) \circ \dot{B}_i(t) dxdv + J,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J \ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \xi_k \theta_n \mathrm{sgn}(v) \partial_v (m_1^\varepsilon + m_2^\varepsilon) dxdv - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \xi_k \theta_n [u_1^\varepsilon \partial_v m_2^\varepsilon + u_2^\varepsilon \partial_v m_1^\varepsilon] dxdv \\
&=: \ J_1 - 2J_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, m_ι^ε $(\iota = 1, 2)$ is continuous in v in a neighborhood of zero, therefore for large k,

$$J_1 = -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta_n(x) [m_1^\varepsilon(t, x, 0) + m_2^\varepsilon(t, x, 0)] dx. \tag{4.9}$$

Moreover, noting the fact $m_\iota \geqslant 0$ $(\iota = 1, 2)$, so for k large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 \ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} \xi_k \theta_n [u_1^\varepsilon \partial_v m_2^\varepsilon + u_2^\varepsilon \partial_v m_1^\varepsilon] dxdv \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta_n(x) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \chi_{\rho_1(s,y)}(v) \varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}(x - y) \varrho_{\varepsilon_2}(t - s) ds dy \partial_v m_2^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \chi_{\rho_2(s,y)}(v) \varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}(x - y) \varrho_{\varepsilon_2}(t - s) ds dy \partial_v m_1^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \Big] dv
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta_n(x)dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \chi_{\rho_1(s,y)}(v)[\delta_{\rho_1(s,y)}(v) - \delta_0(v)]\varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}(x-y)\varrho_{\varepsilon_2}(t-s)dsdym_2^\varepsilon(t,x,v) \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} [\delta_{\rho_2(s,y)}(v) - \delta_0(v)]\varrho_{1,\varepsilon_1}(x-y)\varrho_{\varepsilon_2}(t-s)dsdym_1^\varepsilon(t,x,v)\Big\}dv \\
&\geqslant -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta_n(x)[m_1^\varepsilon(t,x,0) + m_2^\varepsilon(t,x,0)]dx. \qquad (4.10)
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining (4.9)-(4.10), for n and k (k is big enough) be fixed, if one lets ε_2 tend to zero first, ε_1 incline to zero next in (4.8), it yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]\xi_k(v)\theta_n(x)dxdv \\
\leqslant\ & \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]\xi_k f'(v)\mathrm{div}_x(b(x)\theta_n(x))dxdvds \\
&+ \int_0^t \circ dB_i(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]\partial_{x_i}\theta_n\xi_k dxdv \\
=\ & \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]\xi_k f'(v)\mathrm{div}_x(b(x)\theta_n(x))dxdvds \\
&-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]\Delta_x\theta_n\xi_k dxdv \\
&+ \int_0^t dB_i(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} [|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]\partial_{x_i}\theta_n\xi_k dxdv, \quad P-a.s., \qquad (4.11)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last identity, we used partial integration and the following fact (see [22]),

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{x_i}[|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2] \circ dB_i(t) \\
=\ & \partial_{x_i}[|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]dB_i(t) - \frac{1}{2}\Delta_x[|u_1| + |u_2| - 2u_1u_2]dt, \quad P-a.s..
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the last term in (4.11) is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale, and $|u_1| = |u_1|^2, |u_2| = |u_2|^2, |u_1 - u_2| = |u_1 - u_2|^2$, from (4.11), one concludes

$$
\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} |u_1(t) - u_2(t)|dxdv \leqslant \mathbb{E}\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}} |u_1(s) - u_2(s)|f'(v)\mathrm{div}_x b(x)dxdvds
$$

$$\leqslant \quad \|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|u_1(s)-u_2(s)|dxdvds,$$

by taking n to infinity first, k to infinity second, which hints

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho_1(t)-\rho_2(t)|dx=\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|u_1(t)-u_2(t)|dxdv\leqslant 0. \tag{4.12}$$

From (4.12), we complete the proof. □

From above calculation, one clearly has the below comparison result.

Corollary 4.1 ***(Comparison Principle)*** *Let b, f be described in Theorem 4.1 and $\rho_{0,1},\rho_{0,2}\in L^\infty\cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Assume that ρ_1 and ρ_2 are two stochastic entropy solutions of (1.6), with initial values $\rho_{0,1}$ and $\rho_{0,2}$. If $\rho_{0,1}\leqslant\rho_{0,2}$, then with probability 1, $\rho_1\leqslant\rho_2$. In particular, if the initial value is nonnegative, then with probability 1, the unique stochastic solution is nonnegative as well.*

Proof. Clearly, mimicking above calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}[u_1(t,x,v)-u_2(t,x,v)]dxdv\\ =\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_{0,1}(x)-\rho_{0,2}(x)]dx+\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}[u_1(s)-u_2(s)]f'(v)\mathrm{div}_x b(x)dxdvds.\end{aligned}$$

Observing that

$$[u_1(t,x,v)-u_2(t,x,v)]^+=\frac{|u_1-u_2|+(u_1-u_2)}{2},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_1(t,x)-\rho_2(t,x)]^+dx\\ =\ &\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}[u_1(t,x,v)-u_2(t,x,v)]^+dxdv\\ =\ &\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|u_1(t,x,v)-u_2(t,x,v)|dxdv+\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}[u_1(t,x,v)-u_2(t,x,v)]dxdv\\ \leqslant\ &\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\rho_{0,1}(x)-\rho_{0,2}(x)|dx+\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}|u_1(s)-u_2(s)|f'(v)\mathrm{div}_x b(x)dxdvds\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_{0,1}(x)-\rho_{0,2}(x)]dx+\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_{x,v}}[u_1(s)-u_2(s)]f'(v)\mathrm{div}_x b(x)dxdvds+$$

$$\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_{0,1}(x)-\rho_{0,2}(x)]^+dx+\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_1(s,x)-\rho_2(s,x)]^+dxds. \tag{4.13}$$

Owing to the Grönwall inequality, one gains from (4.13) that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_1(t,x)-\rho_2(t,x)]^+dx\leqslant \exp(\|f'\|_{L^\infty_v}\|\mathrm{div}b\|_{L^\infty_x}t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}[\rho_{0,1}(x)-\rho_{0,2}(x)]^+dx,$$

which implies $\rho_1\leqslant\rho_2,\ P-a.s.$. □

5 Regularity

In this section, we give the proof for Theorem 2.2, some details are described as below.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. For $\varepsilon_1>0$ be fixed, if one denotes the unique stochastic weak solution of (3.1) by u_{ε_1}, then (3.27) holds. Since $\rho_0\in BV_x$, one gets the inequality (3.28), and then one gets (3.35). Owing to Fatou's lemma, we conclude with

$$\mathbb{E}\|\rho(t)\|_{BV_x}\leqslant e^{C_0T}\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x},$$

with C_0 is given in (3.13).

On the other hand, if we define $\rho^1(t,x)=\rho(t,x+B(t))$, then the unique stochastic entropy solution of (1.6) meets

$$\begin{cases} d\rho^1(t,x)+b_2(x)\cdot\nabla_x\int_{\mathbb{R}}f'(v)u^1(t,x,v)dvdt=0,\ b_2(x)=b(x+B(t)),\\ u^1(t,x,v)=\chi_{\rho^1(t,x)}(v),\quad \rho^1(t,x)|_{t=0}=\rho_0(x). \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

The calculations from (3.30) to (3.32) use again, for every $t_1,t_2\in(0,T)$ which is sufficiently near (i.e. there exists a positive real number $\lambda>0$, such that $|t_1-t_2|<\lambda$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\rho(t_1)-\rho(t_2)\|_{L^1_x}\\ \leqslant\ & C(\sqrt{|t_1-t_2|\log\log(1/|t_1-t_2|)}+|t_1-t_2|)\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x}\\ \leqslant\ & C|t_1-t_2|^\alpha\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x},\quad P-a.s., \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.

For $t_1, t_2 \in (0, T)$, if $|t_1 - t_2| \geqslant \lambda$, for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, then

$$\|\rho(t_1) - \rho(t_2)\|_{L^1_x} \leqslant C\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^\alpha}{\lambda^\alpha} C\|\rho_0\|_{L^1_x}, \quad P - a.s.. \tag{5.3}$$

From (5.2) and (5.3), we conclude that for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. $\square$

Remark 5.1. Consider the Cauchy problem (1.2), and we suppose that b, f, ρ_0 satisfy the assumptions described in Theorem 4.1. If the entropy solution exists, then it is unique. Besides, if $\rho_0 \in BV_x$, the unique entropy solution is in $L^\infty_t(BV_x) \cap Lip([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$. As a matter of fact, the proof for BV regularity is the same, and the proof for Lipschitz regularity, we only need to replace (5.2) and (5.3) by

$$\|\rho(t_1) - \rho(t_2)\|_{L^1_x} \leqslant C|t_1 - t_2|\|\rho_0\|_{BV_x}. \tag{5.4}$$

Compared with this result, in space variable, noise remains the same regularity, but in time variable, the regularity losses half the order of Hölder exponent approximately. So in the sense of time regularity, noise is bad now.

Remark 5.2. Even though the present result is concerned with $b = b(x) \in L^\infty \cap BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$, it is appropriate for

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t, x) + \mathrm{div} F(\rho) + \partial_{x_i} \rho(t, x) \circ \dot{B}_i(t) = 0, \quad (\omega, t, x) \in \Omega \times (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t, x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t, x) + \mathrm{div}_x F(\rho) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(t, x)|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

with $F \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\rho_0 \in L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Corollary 5.1 *There is a unique (stochastic) entropy solution ρ of ((5.5)) (5.6). Moreover, if $\rho_0 \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then*

(i) for (5.5), $\rho \in L^\infty_t(L^1_\omega(BV_x))$ and for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for every $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$;

(ii) for (5.6), $\rho \in L^\infty_t(BV_x) \cap Lip([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

Acknowledgements

This research was partly supported by the NSF of China grants 11501577 and 11301146.

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, Transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields, Invent. Math. 158 (2) (2004) 227-260.

[2] S. Attanasio, F. Flandoli, Renormalized solutions for stochastic transport equations and the regularization by bilinear multiplication noise, Commun. Part. Diff. Eq. 36 (8) (2010) 1455-1474.

[3] C. Bauzet, G. Vallet, P. Wittbold, The Cauchy problem for a conservation law with a multiplicative stochastic perturbation, J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ. 9 (4) (2012) 661-709.

[4] C. Bauzet, G. Vallet, P. Wittbold, The Dirichlet problem for a conservation law with a multiplicative stochastic perturbation, J. Funct. Anal. 266 (4) (2014) 2503-2545.

[5] I.H. Biswas, A.K. Majee, Stochastic conservation laws: weak-in-time formulation and strong entropy condition, J. Funct. Anal. 267 (7) (2014) 2199-2252.

[6] V.I. Bogachev, Measure theory II, Springer, 2007.

[7] N. Burq, N. Tzvetkov, Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations I: local theory, Invent. Math. 173 (3) (2008) 449-475.

[8] N. Burq, N. Tzvetkov, Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations II: a global existence result, Invent. Math. 173 (3) (2008) 477-496.

[9] A. Bressan, An ill posed Cauchy problem for a hyperbolic system in two space dimensions, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 110 (4) (2003), 103-117.

[10] G. Caginalp, Nonlinear equations with coefficients of bounded variation in two space variables, J. Differ. Equations 43 (1) (1982) 134-155.

[11] G.Q. Chen, Q. Ding, K.H. Karlsen, On nonlinear stochastic balance laws, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 204 (3) (2012) 707-743.

[12] M. Crandatl, A. Majda, Monotone difference approximations for scalar conservation laws, Math. Comp. 34 (1980) 1-21.

[13] G. Crippa, C. De. Lellis, Oscillatory solutions to transport equations, Indiana U. Math. J. 55 (1) (2006) 1-14.

[14] C.M. Dafermos, Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics, Springer, 2006.

[15] A.M. Davie, Uniqueness of solutions of stochastic differential equations, Int. Math. Res. Notices 2007 (1) (2007) 227-239.

[16] A. Debussche, J. Vovelle, Scalar conservation laws with stochastic forcing, J. Funct. Anal. 259 (4) (2010) 1014-1042.

[17] F. Delarue, F. Flandoli, D. Vincenzi, Noise Prevents Collapse of Vlasov-Poisson Point Charges, Commun. Pur. Appl. Math. 67 (10) (2014) 1700-1736.

[18] N. Depauw, Non unicitédes solutions bornées pour un champ de vecteurs BV en dehors d'un hyperplan, CR. Math. 337 (4) (2003) 249-252.

[19] R.J. DiPerna, P.L. Lions, Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces, Invent. Math. 98 (3) (1989) 511-547.

[20] E. Fedrizzi, F. Flandoli, Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations, J. Funct. Anal. 264 (6) (2012) 1329-1354.

[21] J. Feng, D. Nualart, Stochastic scalar conservation laws, J. Funct. Anal. 255 (2) (2008) 313-373.

[22] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, E. Priola, Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation, Invent. Math. 180 (1) (2010) 1-53.

[23] P. Friz, B. Gess, Stochastic scalar conservation laws driven by rough paths, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 33 (4) (2016) 933-963.

[24] J. Glimm, D. Darchesin, O. Mcbryan, Statistical fluid dynamics: unstable fingers, Comm. Math. Phys. 74 (1) (1980) 1-13.

[25] J. Glimm, D. Darchesin, O. Mcbryan, A numerical method for two phase flow with an unstable interface, J. Comput. Phys. 39 (1) (1981) 179-200.

[26] J. Glimm, D.H. Sharp, Stochastic partial differential equations: selected applications in continuum physics, Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: Six Perspectives, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 1997.

[27] M. Hofmanová, A Bhatnagar-Gross-Krook approximation to stochastic scalar conservation laws, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 51 (4) (2015) 1500-1528.

[28] O. Kallenberg, Foundations of modern probability, Springer, 2006.

[29] J.U. Kim, On a stochastic scalar conservation law, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 52 (1) (2003) 227-255.

[30] S.N. Kružkov, First order quasilinear equations in several independent variables, Mat. Sb. 81 (123) (1970) 228-255.

[31] H. Kunita, Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[32] P.L. Lions, B. Perthame, E. Tadmor, A kinetic formulation of multidimensional scalar conservation laws and related equations. J. Am. Math. Soc. 7 (1) (1994) 169-191.

[33] D.J. Luo, S.Z. Fang, Flow of homeomorphisms and stochastic transport equations, Stoch. Anal. Appl. 25 (5) (2007) 1079-1108.

[34] G.Y. Lv, J.L. Wu, Renormalized entropy solutions of stochastic scalar conservation laws with boundary condition, J. Funct. Anal. 271 (8) (2016) 2308-2338.

[35] D.V. Stroock, S.R.S. Varadhan, Diffusion processes with continuous coefficients, I, Commun. Pur. Appl. Math. 22 (3) (1969) 345-400.

[36] G. Vallet, P. Wittbold, On a stochastic first-order hyperbolic equation in a bounded domain, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Qu. 12 (4) (2009) 613-651.

[37] A. Ju. Veretennikov, On strong solutions and explicit formulas for solutions of stochastic integral equations, Math. USSR Sb. 39 (3) (1981) 434-452.

[38] A.I. Vol'pert, Generalized solutions of degenerate second-order quasilinear parabolic and elliptic equations, Adv. Differential Equations 5 (10-12) (2000) 1493-1518.